

Nonperturbative QCD vacuum and colour superconductivity.

N.O.Agasian*, B.O.Kerbikov†, V.I.Shevchenko‡

*Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics
117218, B.Chermushkinskaya 25, Moscow, Russia*

Abstract

We discuss the possibility of existence of colour superconducting state in real QCD vacuum with nonzero $\langle\alpha_s GG\rangle$. We argue, that nonperturbative gluonic fields might play a crucial role in colour superconductivity scenario.

*e-mail: agasyan@vxitep.itep.ru

†e-mail: borisk@heron.itep.ru

‡e-mail: shevchen@heron.itep.ru

1 Introduction

The behaviour of QCD at high density has become recently a compelling subject due to (re)discovery of colour superconductivity [1, 2]. The essence of the phenomenon is the formation of the BCS-type diquark condensate at densities exceeding by a factor $(2 \div 3)$ the normal nuclear density [3]. Colour superconductivity has been studied within different versions of the Nambu–Jona-Lasinio – type model [1, 4, 3] or the instanton model [2, 5]. To our knowledge, however, no attention has been paid to the fact, that as compared to real QCD, both approaches miss important nonperturbative gluonic content of the theory. The NJL model contains the gluon degrees of freedom in a very implicit way: it is argued, that high-frequency mode (one-gluon exchange) after being integrated out gives rise to the effective four quark interaction (see, e.g. [6]). The instanton model deals only with specific field configurations – instantons and antiinstantons. The NJL model with gluon condensate included has been considered in [7] while confining background superimposed on instantons has been treated in [8]

The role played by the gluon degrees of freedom in the problem under consideration is essentially twofold. First, it is assumed, that they are responsible for producing the quark–quark attractive interaction leading at small enough temperatures to the Cooper pairing (thus gluons play the role of phonons over ion lattice speaking in condensed matter terms). On the other hand, the vacuum gluon field fluctuations should be affected by colour superconducting state itself in a way analogous to the Meissner effect in ordinary superconductor. The crucial point is which force will win, i.e. whether superconductivity will survive or will be destroyed by gluonic fields as it happens in the standard BCS theory in the presence of strong enough external magnetic field.

The studies of idealized QCD performed by several authors have shown,

that depending on the chemical potential μ and the temperature T the system displays three possible phases: 1) chiral symmetry breaking without diquark condensation; 2) mixed phase with nonzero values of both chiral and diquark condensates; 3) diquark condensation without symmetry breaking. The system may be described by the thermodynamic potential $\Omega(\phi, \Delta; \mu, T)$, where ϕ and Δ are order parameters, related to the chiral and diquark condensates respectively (explicit definitions will be given below). The potential Ω is expressed in terms of quantum effective action Γ as $\Omega = \Gamma T / V_3$. Suppose, that the potential Ω has been calculated within the framework of some NJL-type model, i.e. with the gluon sector excluded (except for contribution of high-frequency modes, giving the necessary attraction). Consider for simplicity the phase 3) of the system with $\phi = 0, \Delta \neq 0$ and $T = 0$. Let $\Omega(\phi = 0, \Delta_0; \mu, 0)$ be the stationary value of the thermodynamic potential, where Δ_0 is the solution of the gap equation $\partial\Omega/\partial\Delta = 0$ (see below). Now we superimpose the nonperturbative vacuum gluon fields on the above picture. The detailed knowledge of the nonabelian Meissner effect is unfortunately absent. Anyway, it is obvious that the corresponding microscopic picture is far from being trivial. The nonlinear character of the equations of motion for gluon fields is of prime importance here, while usual Meissner effect for abelian fields is essentially linear phenomenon. On the contrary, general symmetry arguments tell us, that part of gluon degrees of freedom becomes massive if the colour gauge invariance is spontaneously broken. It means effective screening of low-frequency modes and therefore it is reasonable to assume, that the formation of the colour gauge invariance – breaking diquark condensate should lead to the decrease of the gluon condensate by some factor, which we assume to be about a few units (but, presumably, not to exactly zero value, as it happens in abelian case). Then it will be energetically favourable for the system to remain in the colour superconducting

state with $\Delta \neq 0$ only if the quantity

$$\epsilon(\kappa) = - \left(1 - \frac{1}{\kappa}\right) \frac{\beta(\alpha_s)}{16\alpha_s} \langle G_{\mu\nu}^a G_{\mu\nu}^a \rangle \quad (1)$$

is less than $\Omega(\phi = \Delta = 0; \mu, 0) - \Omega(\phi = 0, \Delta_0; \mu, 0)$. The factor κ in (1) represents the unknown rate of decrease of the gluon condensate due to superconducting diquark state formation. Note, that $\epsilon(\kappa \rightarrow \infty) = -\epsilon_{vac}$. In what follows we will show, that these two energy gaps have the same order of magnitude unless the κ is close to 1.

It should be noted, that the analogy with the BCS superconductor in external field is somewhat loose here for at least two reasons. First, strong nonperturbative gluonic fields are inherent for the QCD vacuum. The consistent way of analysis should include a set of gap equations for the free energy of the system depending on gluon and different types of quark condensates, determining energetically best values for all of them simultaneously. The second point is the relation between scales, characterizing colour superconductivity and nonperturbative gluon fluctuations. In particular, only modes with the wave lengths larger than the Cooper pair radius are responsible for the supercurrent while the rest do not admit simple interpretation in terms of Ginzburg-Landau theory. We leave the analysis of these complicated problems for the future.

Another important remark is in order. It might be naively assumed, that if the system under study is in the deconfinement region, the vacuum gluonic content may be taken as purely perturbative. There are several reasons, however, why it is not the case. The most important one is the following. Finite density breaks Euclidean $O(4)$ rotational invariance and hence chromoelectric and chromomagnetic components of the correlator $\langle \alpha_s G^2 \rangle_{\mu \neq 0}$ enter on the different footing. In particular, deconfinement, i.e. zero string tension is associated with the vanishing of the electric components, while it is energetically favourable for the magnetic ones to stay nonzero (the same phenomenon

takes place for the temperature phase transition [9]). At the same time it is just strong magnetic field, which is able to destroy the superconductivity.

Needless to say, that the colour superconductivity phenomenon is essentially nonperturbative effect since it requires the formation of the gap, which, being proportional to Λ_{QCD} , cannot be obtained in perturbation theory.

2 General formalism

We start with the QCD Euclidean partition function

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}A \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} \mathcal{D}\psi \exp(-S) \quad (2)$$

where

$$S = \frac{1}{4} \int F_{\mu\nu}^a F_{\mu\nu}^a d^4x + \int \bar{\psi}(-i\gamma_\mu D_\mu - im + i\mu\gamma_4)\psi d^4x \quad (3)$$

We suppress colour and flavour indices and also introduce chemical potential μ (only the case $N_f = 2$; $N_c = 3$ is considered in this paper). Performing integration over the gauge fields one gets effective fermion action in terms of cluster expansion

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} \mathcal{D}\psi \exp\left(-\int d^4x L_0 - S_{eff}\right) \quad (4)$$

with $L_0 = \bar{\psi}(-i\gamma_\mu \partial_\mu - im + i\mu\gamma_4)\psi$ and effective action $S_{eff} = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \langle\langle \theta^n \rangle\rangle$ where $\theta = \int d^4x \bar{\psi}(x) g\gamma_\mu A_\mu^a(x) t^a \psi(x)$ and double brackets denote irreducible cumulants.

To proceed, one is to make considerable simplification of eq.(4). First, only the lowest, four-quark interaction term is usually kept in S_{eff} . Second, it is instructive to consider instead of the original nonlocal kernel some idealized local one, respecting the given set of symmetries. In the problem under study it is common to choose either instanton-induced four-fermion vertex (the choice, adopted in [2, 5]) or different versions of the NJL model [1, 4, 3]

including the one, motivated by one gluon exchange [4]. In the latter case one gets

$$S_{eff} = \int d^4x d^4y (\bar{\psi}(x) \gamma_\mu t^a \psi(x)) (\bar{\psi}(y) \gamma_\mu t^a \psi(y)) D(x-y) \quad (5)$$

with $D(x-y) = g^2 \delta^{(4)}(x-y)$ and where the coupling constant g^2 with the dimension m^{-2} is introduced. We assume, as it has already been mentioned, that this localized form of the kernel does not mimic all gluonic content of the original theory, in other words only some part of gluon degrees of freedom participates in the condensate formation. One way to analyse the role, played by other ones, would be to consider more realistic nonlocal functions $D(x-y)$ (which, in principle, encode all necessary information if we keep only four-quark interaction). This will be done elsewhere, while in the present paper we work with the local form of the action. Performing colour, flavour and Lorentz Fierz [6] transformations and keeping only scalar terms in both $\bar{\psi}\psi$ and $\psi\psi$ channels, we arrive at

$$L_{eff} = g^2 \left[(\bar{\psi}(x) \Lambda \psi(x)) (\bar{\psi}(y) \Lambda \psi(y)) - (\bar{\psi}(x) \Phi_\alpha \psi^C(y)) (\bar{\psi}^C(y) \Phi_\alpha \psi(x)) \right] \quad (6)$$

where

$$\Lambda = \frac{i}{\sqrt{6}} \hat{1}_c \tau_F, \quad \Phi_\alpha = \frac{1}{\sqrt{12}} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \gamma_5 \tau_F^{(2)}$$

and $\psi^C = C \bar{\psi}^T = \gamma_2 \gamma_4 \bar{\psi}^T$. We note, that with only scalar terms kept, the Lagrangian (6) is no more chiral invariant. The attraction in scalar colour antitriplet channel (which also exists if one starts from the instanton-induced interaction) could lead to the formation of the condensate, breaking colour $SU(3)$. In close analogy with [3] we replace the common coupling constant g^2 by two independent constants g_1^2 and g_2^2 corresponding to the two terms in (6). Next step is to write down the partition function and to perform its bosonization. We adopt the standard Hubbard–Stratonovich trick and get

$$Z = \int \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} \mathcal{D}\psi \exp\left(- \int d^4x (L_0 + L_{eff})\right) =$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \int \mathcal{D}\phi \mathcal{D}\Delta \mathcal{D}\Delta^\dagger \exp \left(\int d^4x \left\{ - \left[\frac{\phi^2}{4g_1^2} + \frac{\Delta\Delta^\dagger}{g_2^2} \right] \right. \right. \\
&+ \left. \left. \text{Tr Ln} \begin{pmatrix} 2\Phi C \Delta & i\hat{\partial} + i(m + \phi) - i\gamma_4\mu \\ i\hat{\partial}^T - i(m + \phi) + i\gamma_4\mu & 2\Delta^\dagger C^{-1}\Phi^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \right\} \right) \quad (7)
\end{aligned}$$

For the system of the massless quarks at the phase 3) and $T = 0$ the thermodynamic potential reads (we remind, that $Z \sim \exp(-S) \sim \exp(+\Gamma)$)

$$\Omega = \frac{\Gamma}{V_4} = \frac{|\Delta|^2}{g_2^2} - \frac{1}{V_4} \text{Tr Ln} \begin{pmatrix} 2\Phi C \Delta & i\hat{\partial} - i\gamma_4\mu \\ i\hat{\partial}^T + i\gamma_4\mu & 2\Delta^\dagger C^{-1}\Phi^\dagger \end{pmatrix} \quad (8)$$

The value of the diquark condensate is determined by the gap equation

$$\left. \frac{\partial \Omega}{\partial \Delta} \right|_{\Delta=\Delta_0} = 0 \quad (9)$$

By going in (8) to wave number–frequency space and making use of the gap equation (9), we arrive at the following expression for the thermodynamic potential at its minimum

$$\Omega(\phi = \Delta = 0; \mu, 0) - \Omega(\phi = 0, \Delta_0; \mu, 0) \simeq \frac{\Delta_0^2}{g_2^2 \cdot \ln \left(\frac{M^2}{\Delta_0^2} \right)} \quad (10)$$

where M is the NJL cutoff which is typically about 0.8 GeV [1, 3]. Alternatively, the cutoff may enter via the formfactor or the instanton zero-mode. In the NJL-type calculations the values of the cutoff M and the coupling constant g_2^2 are fitted simultaneously, but no unique "standard" fit exists so far [10]. To estimate the r.h.s. of (10) we have taken for cutoff $M = 0.8 \text{ GeV}$, for coupling $g^2 = 12g_2^2 = (15 \div 40) \text{ GeV}^{-2}$ and the value of the gap in the diquark scalar sector $\Delta_0 = (0.1 \div 0.15) \text{ GeV}$. With these parameters one gets

$$\Omega(\phi = \Delta = 0; \mu, 0) - \Omega(\phi = 0, \Delta_0; \mu, 0) \sim (1 \div 5) \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}^4 \quad (11)$$

To be on a robust quantitative footing and to consider finite temperatures one can replace the estimate (11) by the result of direct numerical calculations

of the thermodynamic potential performed in [3]. Our result (11) is larger than the corresponding value, presented in [3]. The discrepancy may be due to different value of the coupling constant g^2 adopted in [3]. Needless to say, that the larger is the estimate of (10) the larger is the critical field extinguishing superconductivity.

Now let us estimate the expression (1). We use different sets of data from [11] and take for the gluon condensate

$$G_2 = \langle \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} G_{\mu\nu}^a G_{\mu\nu}^a \rangle = (0.014 \div 0.026) \text{ Gev}^4$$

Then for two flavours one gets in one loop

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon(\kappa) &= \left(1 - \frac{1}{\kappa}\right) \cdot \left(11 - \frac{4}{3}\right) \cdot \left(\frac{1}{32}\right) \langle \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} G_{\mu\nu}^a G_{\mu\nu}^a \rangle \sim \\ &\sim \left(1 - \frac{1}{\kappa}\right) \cdot (4 \div 8) \cdot 10^{-3} \text{ Gev}^4 \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

It is seen, that (10) and (12) have the same order of magnitude for $\kappa \geq 2$.

It should be noted, that the estimate (11) given above is rather optimistic in the following sense. If one naively assume the colour superconductor to be the BCS one and take its typical parameters, for example, from [2], then one has at $T = 0$ for the value of the critical magnetic field

$$H_{crit}^2 = 0.64 \cdot (\Delta_0)^2 \cdot (m_q p_F) \quad (13)$$

where $p_F^2 = \mu^2 - m_q^2$, m_q is the constituent quark mass. We take $\mu = (0.4 \div 0.5) \text{ Gev}$ and corresponding $\Delta_0 = (0.04 \div 0.10) \text{ Gev}$ from the paper [2] which are smaller, than the typical values we have analysed before. The maximum of (13) with respect to p_F at the fixed μ is reached for $\mu = \sqrt{2} p_F$ and it gives

$$H_{crit}^2 = (0.8 \div 8) \cdot 10^{-4} \text{ Gev}^4 \quad (14)$$

Strictly speaking we are not allowed to apply formulas like (13) to the colour fields and interpret them in terms of Meissner effect, but we note, that (14) even without any numerical factors is about order of magnitude smaller than (12).

3 Finite density effects

The comparison made in the previous section was intuitively based on the analogy with the Meissner effect in ordinary superconductors. The actual value of the gluon condensate in (12) was taken to be the vacuum one. This is not quite correct, however. Even without the formation of any diquark condensate, the gluon condensate in the hadronic matter is different from that in the vacuum. In order to get an idea about such dependence, let us consider effective dilaton Lagrangian [12]

$$L(\sigma) = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu \sigma)^2 - V(\sigma) \quad ; \quad V(\sigma) = \frac{\lambda}{4} \sigma^4 \left(\ln \frac{\sigma}{\sigma_0} - \frac{1}{4} \right) \quad (15)$$

where dilaton field is defined according to

$$\frac{m_0^4}{64|\epsilon_v|} \sigma^4(x) = -\theta_{\mu\mu}(x) = -\frac{\beta(\alpha_s)}{4\alpha_s} G_{\mu\nu}^a(x) G_{\mu\nu}^a(x)$$

and

$$\lambda = \frac{m_0^4}{16|\epsilon_v|} \quad ; \quad \sigma_0^2 = \frac{16|\epsilon_v|}{m_0^2}$$

where $\epsilon_v = \frac{1}{4} \langle \theta_{\mu\mu} \rangle$ is the nonperturbative vacuum energy density and m_0 - dilaton (i.e. glueball 0^{++} in our case) mass. Low energy dilaton physics can be used for description of the gluon condensate behaviour at finite density and temperature [13]. In the chiral limit masses of nucleons in QCD are determined by the nucleon-dilaton vertex $L_{int} = m_N^* \bar{q}q$ with the effective mass $m_N^* = m_N \cdot (\sigma/\sigma_0)$. In isotopically symmetric system the energy density takes the form:

$$\epsilon(\sigma_n, n) = V(\sigma_n) - V(\sigma_0) + 2 \int_0^{p_F} \frac{d^3p}{(2\pi)^3} \sqrt{p^2 + m_N^{*2}} \quad (16)$$

where $n = n_n + n_p = 2p_F^3/3\pi^2$ is the baryon density and the chemical potential $\mu^2 = p_F^2 + m_N^{*2}$. Being interested in the densities close to the nuclear density

$n_0^{1/3} = 0.1 \text{ GeV}$ we minimize the total energy density with respect to the dilaton field

$$\left. \frac{\partial \epsilon}{\partial \sigma} \right|_{\sigma=\sigma_n} = 0$$

and find in the region $nm_N \ll 16|\epsilon_v|$

$$\left\langle \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} G_{\mu\nu}^a G_{\mu\nu}^a \right\rangle_n = \left\langle \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} G_{\mu\nu}^a G_{\mu\nu}^a \right\rangle_0 \cdot \left(1 - c \frac{n}{n_0} \right) \quad (17)$$

where the factor $c = m_N n_0 / 4|\epsilon_v| \simeq 0.05$. It means, that the decrease of the condensate at the densities of interest is about $(10 \div 25)\%$.

However, we should point out, that the matter may have already the structure of cold quark-gluon plasma instead of being hadronic at the densities of interest. Presumably it would require another type of estimates for the value of the gluon condensate. The reader is referred to the paper [14] where it is argued, that the long-wave part of colour magnetic field which can lead to the Meissner effect is suppressed compared to the critical field by the perturbative coupling constant (which is assumed to be small due to asymptotic freedom). It is important to distinguish the quantum fields considered in [14] which propagate in the quark-gluon plasma from the nonperturbative fields discussed by us here, hence the magnitude of the latter is an "external parameter" with respect to the colour superconductivity problem itself. This question needs further investigation.

4 Discussion

We have confined ourselves in this letter to a very modest aim – to compare the energy gap, typical for the colour superconductor and the contribution to the vacuum energy density, coming from the gluon condensate. We argued, that *if* there is a competition between colour antitriplet scalar diquark and gluon condensates, which is natural to assume from abelian analogy, *then*

it happens on the same energy scale and therefore to take this effect into account is important for the selfconsistent picture. It is clear, that further, more quantitative analysis is needed.

The idealized case of two flavours was investigated in the paper. For chemical potentials exceeding the strange quark mass the $N_f = N_c = 3$ scenario is more physical. It seems, that inclusion of the third flavour does not change our analysis crucially. Moreover, due to the phenomenon of colour-flavour "locking" [4], eight of the nine $((N_c^2 - 1)_{SU(3)} + 1_{U(1)})$ gauge degrees of freedom acquires mass due to the Higgs mechanism in $N_f = 3$ case and therefore colour superconductivity is "complete". According to the line of reasoning adopted in this paper, it means, that $\kappa(N_f = 3)$ should be larger than $\kappa(N_f = 2)$ (for the scalar channel).

To conclude, we have discussed the role played by gluon degrees of freedom in the colour superconductivity and, in particular, we have argued, that nonperturbative gluon fluctuations might be strong enough to destroy the phenomenon. More quantitative analysis of this problem is in progress now.

Acknowledgements

The work was supported in part by RFFI-DFG grant 96-02-00088G. The work of B.K. was also supported by RFFI grant 97-02-16406. V.Sh. acknowledges the ICFPM-INTAS 96-0457 grant. The authors are grateful to I. Dobroskok, D. Ebert, J. Hošek, H.-J. Pirner, K. Rajagopal and Yu.A. Simonov for useful discussions and comments. V.Sh. would like to thank theory group of Řež Nuclear Physics Institute and especially J. Hošek for kind hospitality.

References

- [1] M.Alford, K.Rajagopal, F.Wilczek, Phys.Lett. **B422** (1998) 247.

- [2] R.Rapp, T.Schaefer, E.Shuryak, M.Velkovsky, Phys.Rev.Lett. **81** (1998) 53.
- [3] J.Berges, K.Rajagopal, Nucl.Phys. **B538** (1999) 215.
- [4] M.Alford, K.Rajagopal, F.Wilczek, Nucl.Phys. **B537** (1999) 443.
- [5] G. Carter, D. Diakonov, Nucl.Phys. **A642** (1998) 78.
- [6] J. Bijnens, C Bruno, E. de Rafael, Nucl.Phys. **B390** (1993) 501;
D. Ebert, H. Reinhardt, M. Volkov, Progr.Part.Nucl.Phys. **33** (1994) 1.
- [7] D. Ebert, M. Volkov, Phys.Lett. **B272** (1991) 86.
- [8] Yu. Simonov, Yad.Fiz., **57** (1994) 1491.
- [9] E. Gubankova, Yu. Simonov, Phys.Lett. **B360** (1995) 93.
- [10] S. Klevansky, Rev.Mod.Phys. **64** (1992) 649;
U. Vogl, W. Weise, Progr.Part.Nucl.Phys. **27** (1992) 195;
G. Ripka, *Quarks Bound by Chiral Fields*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1997.
- [11] H.G. Dosch, Proc. of the Int. School of Physics "Enrico Fermi", "*Selected topics in nonperturbative QCD*", IOS Press, 1996;
M.D'Elia, A. DiGiacomo, E. Meggiolaro, Phys.Lett. **B408** (1997) 315;
S. Narison, Phys.Lett. **B387** (1996) 162.
- [12] A.A. Migdal, M.A. Shifman, Phys.Lett. **B114** (1982) 445;
J. Ellis, J. Lanik, Phys.Lett. **B150** (1985) 289.
- [13] N.O. Agasyan, JETP Lett. **57** (1993) 208;
N.O. Agasyan, D. Ebert, E. Ilgenfritz, Nucl.Phys. **A637** (1998) 135.
- [14] D.T. Son, hep-ph/9812287.